



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/747,845	12/29/2003	David S. Foulke	FKE1USA	6435
270	7590	09/16/2004	EXAMINER	
HOWSON AND HOWSON ONE SPRING HOUSE CORPORATION CENTER BOX 457 321 NORRISTOWN ROAD SPRING HOUSE, PA 19477			DANG, HUNG XUAN	
			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
			2873	

DATE MAILED: 09/16/2004

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Hr

Office Action Summary

Application No.

10/747,845

Applicant(s)

FOULKE ET AL.

Examiner

Hung X Dang

Art Unit

2873

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --
Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 27 August 2004.
 2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-21 is/are pending in the application.
 4a) Of the above claim(s) 7-10 and 16-21 is/are withdrawn from consideration.
 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-6 and 11-15 is/are rejected.
 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
 Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
 Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
 a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
 1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- 1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
 2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
 3) ☒ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)
 Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____.
 4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413)
 Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____.
 5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
 6) ☐ Other: _____.

Applicant's election without traverse of Group I, claims 1-6 and 11-15 in the reply filed on 8/27/04 is acknowledged.

Information Disclosure Statement

1. The Information disclosure Statements filed on 4/8/04 has been considered.

Claims Objection

2. Claim 2 is objected to because of the following informalities: Claim 2 depend on itself. Appropriate correction is required.

Claim 2 is objected to under 37 CFR 1.75 as being a substantial duplicate of claim part of claim 1, lines 5-9, "the opaque layer of film ... uncovered and transparent". When two claims in an application are duplicates or else are so close in content that they both cover the same thing, despite a slight difference in wording, it is proper after allowing one claim to object to the other as being a substantial duplicate of the allowed claim. See MPEP § 706.03(k).

Claims Rejection Under 35 USC - 103

3. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the

invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains.

Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

Claims 1-6 and 11-15 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over **Capes** (5,561,480) in view of **Einhorn** (6,003,990).

Capes discloses keyboard practice glasses which comprises an eyeglass frame having a pair of transparent lenses 50, each lens having an upper 54 and opaque lower region 56 covering at least part of the lower region thereof while leaving at least a portion of the upper region 54 thereof uncovered and transparent (see figure 1 and the related disclosure).

Capes does not disclose that an opaque layer adhere to the lenses by electrostatic attraction and the opaque layer are peelable from the lenses.

Einhorn, however, discloses the layer 18 adhere to the lenses by electrostatic attraction and the layer are peelable from the lenses.

Because Capes and Einhorn are both from the same field of endeavor, the purpose of quickly and impermanently changing one or more optical characteristics of the spectacle lenses as disclosed by Einhorn would have been recognized as an art pertinent art of Capes.

It would have been obvious, therefore, at the time the invention was made to a person having skill in the art to construct the eyeglasses frame, such as the one disclosed by Capes, with an opaque layer adhere to the lenses by electrostatic attraction and the opaque layer are peelable from the lenses, such as disclosed by Einhorn for the purpose of quickly and impermanently changing one or more optical characteristics of the spectacle lenses.

With regard to claims 6 and 14, Capes and Einhorn do not disclose the upper edge of the opaque layer is convex as that claimed by applicant.

Although the Capes and Einhorn devices do not teach the exact shape of the opaque layer as that claimed by Applicant, the shape differences are considered obvious design choices and are not patentable unless unobvious or unexpected results are obtained from these changes. It appears that these changes produce no functional differences and therefore would have been obvious.

4. Any inquiry concerning this communication should be directed to Examiner Dang at telephone number (571) 272-2326.

9/04



HUNG DANG

PRIMARY EXAMINER

TC 2800